

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-24 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claims 4, 11 and 18 are cancelled herein.

Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-24 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-24 were previously rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 19 and 21-24 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

MPEP § 707.07(f) states that although an "[a]pplicant 's arguments with respect to [claims] have been considered ... moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection ... "[t]he examiner **must**, however, address any arguments presented by the applicant **which are still relevant to any references being applied.**" In view of the multiple arguments presented below, Applicant respectfully requests a response to each argument.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-4, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kaply and Haynes. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

At pages 4-6, claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kaply and Haynes and further in view of Ludolph.

PRIOR ART DOES NOT RESPOND TO SCROLL CANCELLATION BY RETURNING FIRST REGION SO THAT MARK WITHIN IS VISIBLE

Claim 1 recites "a setting section configured to set a mark within a first display region of a display image displayed on a display unit ... and ... a return section configured to automatically return the display to said first display region in response to a cancellation [by input/key release] of the scrolling process by said scrolling section so that the mark is visible in said first display

that is displayed". The rejection compared this mark feature (in cancelled claims 4, 11, and 18) to Ludolph's placement of borders around word processing and spreadsheet windows. However, the borders of Ludolph merely indicate the position of the corresponding window. Ludolph's borders are not within the window nor do they indicate a position within the window. Furthermore, a border is not a "mark".

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

PRIOR ART DOES NOT DISCUSS OR SUGGEST A SINGLE SCROLLING PROCESS  
RETURNING TO A REGION THAT WAS DISPLAYED WHEN SCROLLING STARTED

Claim 1 recites changing "from the first display region of the display image to a second display region of the display image that is different from the first display region, by a scrolling process in response to a continuous, uninterrupted activation of an input device or key", and automatically returning "the display to said first display region in response to a cancellation of the scrolling process by said scrolling section ... wherein the cancellation corresponds to a release of the input device or key". See also claims 8 and 15.

It is known in the prior art to generally start a scrolling process to scroll a first region out of view and a second region into view. However, in the prior art, when the scrolling process is cancelled by the user, the second region in view at the time of cancellation is kept in view – the first region is not returned to. With claims 1, 8, and 15, the user's action of canceling the scrolling process (as by an input or key release) causes the responsive effect of returning display of the initial first region that was in view when the scrolling process started.

The rejection notes that this feature is not disclosed by Kaply or Cowart. The rejection cites Haynes as allowing the prior art combination "to return the scroll object to its [sic] home position and the scrolling of data is stopped with a release of the scroll object". The "return" in Haynes refers to the return of a detachable scrolling widget (control 51) to its original "home position" 57. The "scroll object" is a control 51, which is not the thing/view/regions being scrolled by a scrolling process. Hayne's scrolling target (display image) is scrollable client area 37, and the current scrolled-to portion that is being displayed when scrolling is cancelled is maintained when scrolling ends. There is no discussion or suggestion in Haynes to return a pre-scrolling displayed portion, region, view etc. of the document 37 when the scrolling process is cancelled. The addition of Haynes in effect adds nothing to the prior art combination; it is well known in the art to stop a scrolling process when scrolling is cancelled by an input release etc. The addition

of Haynes only provides returning a dragged widget/control to its home position, which is not the same as returning a region that is subjected to scrolling.

Furthermore, the rejection proposes extending the concept of scrolled displayed regions in Kaply to regions related to the display of menus in Cowart. However, the regions in Cowart are not scrolled "by a scrolling process" as recited in claims 1, 8, and 15 and as cited in the cited portion of Kaply. Menus or related regions are not displayed or changed by a scrolling process, rather they are displayed when they are activated (independent of whether they are scrolled or highlighted) and undisplayed when they are deactivated. As noted in the Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, "scrolling" is a well-understood term that can indicate "to move text or graphics up or down or across a display screen as if by unrolling a scroll ... to cause (text or graphics on a display screen) to move in scrolling". One skilled in the art would not equate a "scrolling" process (whether in the claims or Kaply) with a process of displaying and undisplaying menu regions.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### COMBINATION RENDERS KAPLY AND HAYNES UNFIT FOR THEIR INTENDED PURPOSES

The rejection reasons that combining "use of multiple display regions and automatic return of the display taught by Coward with the scrolling and windowing disclosed by Kaply ... allows the user to instantly return to the original screen after making a selection allowing the user to make a new selection while saving time".

Kaply states that "it is a general object of the present invention [where] a user may quickly navigate to any open task" (col. 2, lines 52-55), and "[t]hus, the invention provides a simple and efficient way to alter the focus on a windowing display environment". This is provided because "windows may easily become 'lost' behind other windows on the display" (col. 7, lines 7-9). A given window that is the focus window is "at the active position on the display screen" (col. 1, lines 64-67). Kaply restates these concepts throughout and makes clear that its primary purpose is to scroll through windows to bring any one of the same from the background for focus and display at the forefront. Haynes is also intended to provide traditional scrolling with improved control of the scrolling process. When the scroll object is released, scrolling stops and the current view does not change. Returning to a pre-scroll view would be contrary to *stopping* the scrolling process when the object is released.

In sum, the very purpose of scrolling in the cited art is to scroll a new region or window into focus or view and keep that focus or view when the scrolling is cancelled. The rejection suggests defeating this purpose by modifying the references to return a pre-scrolling view when scrolling is cancelled. In other words, the rejection suggests modifying Kaply and Haynes to have a return feature when scrolling is cancelled. As stated in MPEP § 2143.01, "[i]f [the] proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification." Modifying either Kaply or Haynes to have a return feature when scrolling is cancelled by a key/input release would defeat their explicit purposes. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, a suggestion to so significantly destroy the primary purpose of prior art scrolling should be provided by the prior art itself, not by the suggestion of the Examiner. The rejection suggests "allow[ing] the user to instantly return ... after making a selection". One skilled in the art would not attempt to make a combination that is self-contradictory; a user cannot make a selection while they are controlling a scrolling process with continuous key/input activation.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 2 recites "both said first display region and said second display region are displayed within a single window which is displayed on the display screen". This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 15 July 2004

By: James Strom  
James T. Strom  
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501